

**REMARKS**

This response responds to the Office Action dated March 27, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0149621) in view of *Anft, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,146,005).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Applicants respectfully point out that the present application claims priority from Japanese Application 2002-059118 filed March 5, 2002. Attached to this response is a Certified Translation of the priority document. Applicants respectfully point out that for the purposes of using *Anft, et al.* as the prior art in the United States, the effective prior art date is March 6, 2002 which is after Applicants' priority date. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Anft, et al.* is not a proper reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 3, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi, et al.* and *Anft, et al.* and further in view of *Tatsuya, et al.* (JP 2001-184158); claims 4-5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi, et al.* and *Anft, et al.* and further in view of *Mugura, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054106); and claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yamaguchi, et al.* and *Anft, et al.*, and further in view of *Mugura, et al.* and *Tatsuya, et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since *Anft, et al.* is not a proper reference, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2, 4-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: June 24, 2009

By: 

Ellen Marcie-Emas  
Reg. No. 32,131  
Tel. (202) 292-1530